

Service evaluation of “GP at Door” of Accident and Emergency Services in Eastern England

Dr Julii Brainard ¹
Mr. Aiden Rice ²
Mr. Gareth Hughes ²
Dr Paul Everden ^{1,2}

¹Norwich Medical School, University of East Anglia Norwich NR4 7TJ, UK

²North Norfolk Primary Care, Alkmaar House, Alkmaar Way, Norwich NR6 6BF, UK

* **Corresponding author:** j.brainard@uea.ac.uk, tel. +44-1603-591151. Postal Address as above

Running title: Full general practice surgery services at A&Es in England: Service evaluation

ORCID Julii Brainard 0000-0002-5272-7995

Word Count: Main manuscript: 3150. 2 tables, 2 figures, 1 text box, ~24 references, ~200 words in abstract

Conflict of interest: All authors declare that we have no conflict of interest. Service activity data were collated by a contracted third party organization, Paradigm Leaders. PL had no role in data analysis or writing this document or its conclusions.

Ethical approval for this study was granted by the University of East Anglia Faculty of Medicine and Health Ethics Committee (Reference: ETH2122-1954, 22 June 2022).

Funding

The services were hosted by the JPUH and QEHL and funded by Norfolk & Waveney integrated care system and JPUH. Dr. Brainard is affiliated to the National Institute for Health Research Health Protection Research Unit (NIHR HPRU) in Emergency Preparedness and Response at King’s College London in partnership with the UK Health Security Agency (UK HSA) and collaboration with the University of East Anglia. The views expressed are those of the authors and not necessarily those of any collaborating or funder institution.

Author contributions:

PE helped design the service and conceived of the evaluation, which was designed by JB and PE. AR and JB designed data collection and secured ethics and research governance approval. JB and AR planned and undertook analysis, JB wrote the first draft and assembled revisions. All authors revised for content.

Service evaluation of “GP at Door” of Accident and Emergency Services in Eastern England

Abstract

Aims: To describe activity and outcomes after streaming low urgency attenders to general practice services at door of Accident and Emergency departments (GDAE), including possible benefits to co-located emergency departments.

Methods: As a service evaluation, we describe GDAE users, their reasons for presentation, wait times, outcomes and co-located emergency department performance metrics at two hospitals in eastern England.

Findings: Each GDAE saw about 928 patients per month. Wait times for usual A&E care relatively shortened at only one site. Reattendances were common (about 10% of attenders), 75% of GDAE attenders were seen within 1 hour of arrival, 7% of patients initially allocated to GDAE were referred back to A&E for further investigations, 59% of GDAE patients were treated and discharged with no further treatment or referral required. Pain, injury, infection or feeling generally unwell each comprised > 10% of primary reasons for attendance. Referrals to specialist health services were outcome for 4% and 16% at respective sites.

Conclusions: About 26,000 A&E attendances appear to have been prevented. Patients were seen quickly at both GDAE sites, while there were more specialist referrals or shorter wait times for usual A&E services at only one site. Process evaluation could illuminate reasons for these differences.

Keywords

Accident and Emergency; low acuity presentations; wait times; service evaluation

Introduction

Attendances to UK National Health Service (NHS) accident and emergency departments (A&Es) have risen steadily since the 1990s, for diverse and many reasons. [1] In 2004, NHS A&Es were set a target (key performance indicator, KPI) to admit, transfer for treatment or discharge at least 95% of attending patients within four hours of presentation (4hKPI). [2] Waits above 5 hours in A&E have been linked to higher mortality within 30 days after attendance [3] as well as longer hospital stays for patients admitted from A&E. [4] Most NHS A&Es have failed the 4hKPI target in most time periods, since 2016. [5] There is thus huge ongoing interest in innovative ways to better manage the needs of persons attending A&E to try to help A&Es achieve fast care delivery and reduce risk of health harms associated with delays to treatment or inappropriate treatment.

Previous observations [6-9] suggested that 15-44% of Emergency Department attenders in Britain sought health care for conditions that are suitable for other health services, especially primary care, where care could be administered by general practitioners (GPs) themselves and/or advanced nurse practitioners (ANPs). Putting A&E attenders in need of GP-level treatment on a more appropriate pathway seems likely to produce many benefits: fewer breaches of the 4hKPI, faster resolution of health complaints for all, more proportionate investigation and treatment pathway, and better chances of continuity of care. [8] During the COVID-19 pandemic, shorter waiting times and faster treatment was also desirable to reduce risk of nosocomial COVID-19 transmission. [10]

Since 2011, it is increasingly common for GPs to be incorporated into A&E streaming and for GP-services to be sited as distinctive service areas within or adjacent to NHS A&Es. [11] NHS five year planning [12] stated that every A&E should put in place ‘front-door clinical streaming’, to quickly find the most appropriate pathways for A&E attenders. One way to implement such streaming is via an immediately available GP-level service as alternative to A&E. Here we evaluate programmes that offered the full range of usual GP services to walk-in patients at two acute care providers in England. In the context of a service evaluation study design, using routinely collected and published data, we consider aspects of service provision including: activity (counts of presentations), socio-demographic profiles of service

users, reasons for presentation, movement to a more urgent pathway, service user satisfaction, data about reattendances and concurrent performance of the 4hKPI in co-located A&E compared to similar A&Es elsewhere in England.

Methods

Service Description

GDAE services were commissioned by the Norfolk and Waveney integrated care system (N&WICS), in coastal eastern England. 97% of hospital attendances by the approximately one million patients registered with N&WICS are at three acute care providers. [13] A pilot GP at Door of A&E (GDAE) service ran at the region's largest acute care centre (Norwich and Norfolk University Hospital, NNUH) from December 2019 to February 2020 and is described elsewhere. [14] The GDAE service hoped to provide patient and system benefits: converting unplanned to planned treatment; providing clinician access to full primary care record which was used in assessment; primary care records to be updated immediately; reduction in unnecessary investigations and more appropriate risk management.

GDAE services were initiated and replicated in the NNUH format at the other two secondary care providers in N&WICS in late 2021/early 2022: Queen Elizabeth Hospital (QEH) and James Paget University Hospital (JPUH). The GDAEs at JPUH and QEH ran 7 days/week, 9am-9pm. Clinical GDAE staff were typically at one GP and one ANP. Data about the GDAEs were available from service initiation, 16 months at the JPUH (October 2021-January 2023) and 12 months at the QEH (Feb 2022-January 2023).

The GDAE care pathway is illustrated and described at length elsewhere. [14] Patients attending the A&E walk-in entrance (arrival not by ambulance) were met by a GP or ANP who triaged them to the GDAE service or usual A&E care. Bespoke triage criteria were applied according to criteria set out in the Appendix and relying on clinical acumen. Patient care during this attendance was meant to be identical to care available at their own registered GP surgery. GDAE patients were booked in and asked for consent to access their

primary care records. Care was provided by a GP or ANP and primary care records updated accordingly. Transfer back to the usual A&E pathway was possible at any time.

Activity and Outcomes

These services were described and evaluated using the data and outcomes listed below, from data routinely collected.

- Service user descriptions (sex, age, deprivation levels)
- Total GDAE activity (counts of attendances, appointments, and dispositions)
- Wait times
- Outcome after completing GDAE appointment
- Frequency of reattendance
- Most common reasons for attendance to GDAE, including among persons who reattended during the monitoring period
- How well each of the co-located A&Es concurrently met 4hKPI compared to historical data or similar A&Es

Data: Service Users

Data were routinely collected in electronic medical records (SystmOne and Symphony).

The data described individual GDAE attenders resident in both N&W and out of area, using the below fields:

- Unique patient identifier
- GDAE Location
- Date of attendance
- Time at booking in
- Appointment status (eg., finished or cancelled)
- Gender
- Age
- IMD2019 group quintile
- Reason for attending
- Treatment outcome (eg., referral, discharge or not recorded)
- Wait from arrival time to time seen (minutes)

The Index of Multiple Deprivation 2019 (IMD2019) [15] is a national ranking of relative deprivation in residential areas. These ranks were available in five ordinal categories (1 = most deprived to 5 = least deprived) relative to all-England. Available (in system coding at

time of booking) reasons for attendance (descriptions of primary complaint when patient presented) are listed in Box 1.

Box 1.

Unwell/Cough/Headache/Fever	Gynaecological
Swelling/Lumps/Bumps	Genitourinary symptoms
Septicaemia	Gastrointestinal problem
Seizure	Eye/Vision problem
Rash/Skin/Cyst/Allergy/Discolouring	Eating/Drinking problem
Pregnancy	Ear/Hearing problem
Poisoning	DVT
Pain/Soreness	Dressings/PostOp problems
Other general symptoms	Dizziness/Faint/Confusion
Nervous system symptoms	Diabetes
Nausea and vomiting	Dental
Medication	Burn / Scald
Insect bite	Bleeding
Injury/Fall	Asthma/breathing problem
Infection/Ulceration	Anxiety/Shuddering/Mental Health
Hernia	Animal bite
Heart/Circulatory	

Primary reasons for attending A&E, recorded at GDAE booking N&W

A&Es.

Data: Four hour target for discharge or admission for NHS A&Es

NHS England publishes statistics (percentages) for how many patients completed their A&E visit within four hours. Just prior to GDAE initiation, in September 2021, the JPUH A&E had 7135 completed attendances, the QEH had 6487 attendances. From NHS England datasets, we extracted 4hKPI values for prior 12 and subsequent months after GDAE services started at JPUH and QEH, as well as for all (n=23) comparator type 01 (full range of urgent care services provided) NHS emergency departments that had somewhat similar attendances (between 4000 and 10,000) in September 2021. The 23 comparator sites are listed in the Appendix. Many initiatives to try to improve the 4hKPI are happening widely in the NHS, although we do not know their full extent at each of these specific 23 comparator sites. Rather, our rationale was to try to explore whether the 4hKPI at JPUH and QEH had improved, deteriorated or remained static compared to KPI performance over a similar period at comparable NHS A&Es. We also compared the 4hKPI at JPUH/QEH, pre- and post-implementation of their GDAE services. We looked at overall 4hKPI at both sites and disaggregated wait times by major and minor acuity problems at JPUH; this disaggregation was unavailable for the QEH.

Service user satisfaction

We summarise responses to an online survey that service users were invited to take; survey questions are in the Appendix.

Analysis

Descriptive statistical analysis, including comparisons between the JPUH and QEKL using tests of proportionality or distribution difference: chi square, Kolmogorov-Smirnov and Mann Whitney U test. Significance threshold was $p < 0.05$. Concurrent statistics for the 4hKPI are provided and discussed narratively before and after the N&W GDAE services were deployed (first 12 months only), comparing JPUH and QEH with their own historical data and similar A&E departments in England.

Results

Service overview: Activity, users and their outcomes

Table 1 shows overview information for each and both services. Over 99% of patients booked into GDAE attended their appointments. Other bookings did not proceed due to cancellation (by user or service) or when patient did not attend. Detailed demographics and outcomes are provided for only patients who completed appointments; denominators for percentage calculations exclude records where an attribute was not recorded. Median age and age distribution of attenders were nearly identical at the sites (median = 33 years, range 0-100). Items in bold font in Table 1 had significant proportional differences (chi square test) between JPUH and QEH. JPUH patients were significantly more likely to come from the most deprived quintile areas, 36.9% vs. 26.1% at QEH. QEH had more attendances by patients resident outside Norfolk and Waveney. 12.6% of JPUH service users made repeat attendances, compared to 9.3% of QEH patients. The most GDAE attendances by an individual at each site was 14. The proportions of several treatment outcomes differed significantly between sites in some respects: QEH patients were more likely to be referred to other services (A&E or specialisms) or to be referred back to their GP with recommendations for further treatment/investigations.

Timing of attendance and waits to be seen

For patients who completed appointments, Figures 1a-1c depict these aspects of service attendance: arrival time (resolved to nearest hour); month of attendance (last/concurrent 12 months only); wait from arrival time to time seen (whole minutes). There was negligible difference between sites with respect to proportion of attendances in any specific calendar month (Figure 1b). However, both times of arrival (1a) and wait times (1c, from arrival to being seen) were different between sites. 55.6% of QEH patients arrived by 2pm, compared to 48.9% of JPUH patients (difference significant at $p < 0.001$, Kolmogorov-Smirnov test). Elapsed time from arrival to being seen was greater at QEH ($p < 0.001$, Mann Whitney U test), with QEH median elapsed time = 26 minutes (IQR 8-51), while the time from arrival to being

seen at JPUH was median 22 minutes (IQR 7-45). Durations of actual appointments at both sites were extremely similar: QEH median 15 (IQR 11-21) and JPUH median 16 (IQR 11-22). We also looked at proportions arriving by day of week (eg., Monday, Tuesday...) and found no significant difference between sites (data not shown).

< Figure 1 about here >

Table 1. Service activity and users overview

	JPUH: n, %	QEH: n, %	All: n, %
Appointments made	18,212	10,656	28,868
Appointments attended	18,087, 99.3%	10,627, 99.7%	28,714, 99.5%
<i>Of those who completed an appointment with GDAE ...</i>			
Females	9276, 51.2%	5578, 52.5%	14,854, 51.7%
Median Age (IQR)	33, 14-55	32, 12-55	33, 13-55
In most deprived quintile	6658, 36.9%	2752, 26.1%	9410, 32.8%
Resident in N&W	16,763, 92.2%	7683, 72.3%	24,446, 85.1%
<i>Reattendance</i>			
Unique patients	15,398	9534	24,932
# Patients who made 2 visits	1484, 9.6%	726, 7.6%	2210, 8.9%
... 3 visits	311, 2.0%	93, 0.98%	404, 1.6%
.... 4 visits or more	149, 0.97%	48, 0.50%	197, 0.79%
<i>Outcome after being seen</i>			
<i>Discharged after...</i>			
Treatment with no further treatment required	11,629, 64.4%	5220, 49.2%	16,849, 58.8%
Not treated with no further treatment required	2618, 14.5%	1468, 13.8%	4086, 14.3%
Unclear if treated, but no referral or further treatment required	583, 3.2%	303, 2.9%	888, 3.1%
<i>Referred to...</i>			
GP, further action recommended	1423, 7.9%	904, 8.5%	2327, 8.1%
GP, for watchful waiting	21, 0.1%	1, 0.01%	22, 0.1%
Specialty service	770, 4.3%	1706, 16.1%	2476, 8.6%
A&E immediately	1007, 5.6%	1007, 9.5%	2014, 7.0%
Patient declined further treatment or referral	3, 0.02%	(none)	3, 0.01%

Note: Outcomes were mutually exclusive. If patients were treated prior to a referral was not recorded. Items in bold were significantly different between JPUH and QEH at $p \leq 0.05$.

Reattendance and reasons for presentation

Primary reasons for presentations that comprised at least 1% of visits are listed individually in Table 2; all other reasons (such as ‘diabetes’) each comprised < 1% of visit reasons each and are grouped under “Other conditions”. 925 persons attended the QEH GDAE more than once in the 12 months of monitoring, 1945 persons reattended the JPUH GDAE more than once in 16 months of service operation. Persons who attended more than once had a very similar distribution of reasons as single occasion attenders. The largest difference between one-time and repeat attenders, is that reattendances at QEH were much more likely to be for feeling ‘generally unwell’ : 18.3% among repeat attenders vs. 13.5% for full group.

Table 2. Primary reason for attendance to GDAE services

Reason for attendance	All attendances		Reattenders	
	JPUH n=17295	QEH n=10606	JPUH n=1945	QEH n=867
Animal bite	2.0%	< 1 %	1.5%	< 1 %
Asthma/Breathing	2.6%	2.1%	3.1%	2.3%
Dental	6.1%	4.6%	6.1%	4.4%
Dressings/PostOp problems	2.7%	1.2%	3.9%	2.3%
DVT	< 1%	1.5%	< 1 %	1.0%
Ear/hearing problem	3.4%	3.7%	4.8%	5.0%
Eye/Vision problem	4.0%	7.3%	3.1%	5.1%
Gastrointestinal problems	4.0%	5.5%	3.8%	6.3%
Gynaecological	1.1%	1.7%	1.3%	1.6%
Infection/Ulceration	11.4%	9.6%	13.3%	11.4%
Injury/Fall	13.3%	12.3%	8.2%	7.5%
Insect bite	1.3%	< 1%	1.1%	< 1 %
Nervous system symptoms	< 1%	1.2%	< 1 %	1.2%
Pain/Soreness	17.9%	16.9%	15.7%	14.0%
Rash/Skin/Cyst/Allergy/Discolouring	4.5%	4.1%	5.4%	6.5%
Swelling/Lumps/Bumps	1.2%	1.7%	1.2%	1.7%
Unwell/Cough/Headache/Fever	10.2%	13.5%	12.8%	18.3%
Other stated conditions (each <1%)	14.4%	13.1%	14.6%	11.3%

Note: Totals are for visits with presenting complaint recorded; there were additional visits without reason for presentation recorded. PostOp = postoperative problems.

< Figure 2 about here >

4 hour target statistics, study sites and in similar A&Es

Figure 2a illustrates overall 4hKPI performance at JPUH and QEH A&Es each month, compared to a group of similar size (activity level) A&Es in England that also provide a full range (Type 1) of emergency department services. On Figures 2a and 2b, the 4hKPI of median performing comparator A&E is indicated with the central black line. The full range of comparator 4hKPIs is denoted by grey shaded areas. Further disaggregation was available at JPUH to generate Figure 2b (majors treatment streams at JPUH and comparator A&Es), while comparisons for the minors patients is described below in text. Information for June 2021 is interpolated on the majors chart because only two relevant A&Es reported majors 4hKPIs this month. On Figures 2a and 2b, dashed lines indicate the period prior to the introduction of the GDAE services at JPUH / QEH (minimum 12 months before). The GDAE services did not coincide with consistently improved overall 4hKPI at JPUH or QEH compared to their own preceding 12 months of data. However, it makes more sense to consider the 4hKPI relative to the comparator group of A&Es, given that there is long term deterioration in 4hKPI at all NHS A&Es, a decline which has accelerated since 2019. [16]

For attendances with minor acuity (“minors”), JPUH 4hKPI statistics prior to GDAE service were median 93.9% (range 48.6-100%). After GDAE started the JPUH minors 4hKPI was median 99.85% (range 99.3-100%). For comparator A&Es throughout the 28 month period, the minors 4hKPI among comparator A&Es was median 99.9% (range 61.3-100%). The JPUH 4hKPI for minors was much closer to the comparator performance in the period after GDAE was introduced. This result is considered with caution because while missing data were unusual for majors or overall 4hKPI, the minors-only 4hKPI was often available for only 10-15 of 23 possible comparator A&Es.

Table 2. Results of patient satisfaction survey

Question	JPUH	QEH	Combined
<i>Who referred you to A&E today?</i>			
No one/ brought self	61%	73%	65%
NHS111 (telephone/online advice service)	22%	6.7%	15%
GP advised attendance	9.8%	20%	14%
Chemist/pharmacist	2.4%	0%	1.4%
Nurse in A&E	2.4%	0%	1.4%
St. John Ambulance	2.4%	0%	1.4%
<i>Would you recommend the service to friends and family?</i>			
Yes	90%	97%	93%
No	10%	3%	6.9%
<i>Were you aware of this service prior to arrival?</i>			
Yes	15%	23%	18%
No	85%	77%	82%
<i>How did you find person who met you at the entrance ...</i>			
Good or Excellent	86%	96%	90%
Fair	5%	3%	4%
Poor or Very Poor	2%	0%	1%
<i>Booking receptionist was ...</i>			
Very helpful	93%	97%	94%
Somewhat helpful	5%	0%	2.8%
Neither helpful nor unhelpful	2%	0%	1.4%
Unhelpful or very unhelpful	0%	0%	0%
No receptionist only clinicians at arrival	0%	3%	1.4%
<i>How did you find consultation with clinician ...</i>			
Good or Excellent	95%	100%	97.2%
Fair or Poor (user entered both answers)	2.4%	0%	1.4%
Poor	2.4%	0%	1.4%
Very Poor	0%	0%	0%
<i>How do you think we could improve the services?</i>			
No comment/Nothing needs improvement	76%	67%	72%
Wait times could improve	7.1%	6.7%	6.9%
Should be publicised more	2.4%	13%	6.9%
Other specific comments or suggestions	14%	13%	14%

Compared to similar A&Es, the JPUH and QEH were consistently in the 50% of lower performing A&Es prior to GDAE introduction. After GDAE, the JPUH service had consistent improvement relative to the comparators in 4hKPIs, overall (Figure 2a), for majors (Figure 2b) and for minors (data stated in text). In contrast, the QEH was among the 25% of lowest performing A&Es in this group of A&Es before and after GDAE. These data do not show that, compared to a diversity of other wait-reduction initiatives that other similar A&Es must have implemented, that GDAEs have delivered consistent 4hKPI improvements.

Service user satisfaction

42 patients at JPUH and 32 patients at QEH gave data about patient satisfaction (Table 2). There were many very positive comments about care received, naming individual clinicians and specific points of gratitude. Most respondents said that there was nothing they could think of to improve the service. There were three negative statements in the open text responses: 1) at-door streamer made someone feel like a time-waster; 2) excess walking distance from A&E entrance to entrance to GDAE; 3) brusque manner of consultation GP; all negative comments were at the JPUH.

Discussion

There is a long-standing objective (NHS [12]) that every A&E should put in place ‘front-door clinical streaming’, to quickly find the most appropriate pathways for A&E attenders. One way to implement such streaming is with use of an immediately available GP-level service.

Over 26,000 attendances at these study sites were diverted to GDAE away from A&E. Recent other analyses concluded that primary care clinicians working in A&Es did not increase efficiency of services, improve clinical outcomes, patient or staff experiences. [17, 18] However, those studies did note that there is a large variety in how primary care clinicians work at A&Es [19], with likely resulting variations in benefits that may result. Our findings for “full-service” GP services co-located at two A&Es were that the 4hKPI improved in several domains concurrent with GDAE service deployment at the JPUH, but not at the QEH. The reasons for this difference probably requires process evaluation [20] to thoroughly understand, and to inform whether the GDAE service should be credited or if other factors

led to strong relative improvement at JPUH but not QEH. For instance, management of admission bed availability that differed between the sites may have had the greatest impact on 4hKPIs. Concurrently during this period the QEH had to contend with failing infrastructure which may have undermined efficacy and quality of services. [21] Also relevant may be somewhat different aspects between the sites with respect to times of day when patients attend or their demographic profiles. We intend to explore GDAE attendee demographic traits in a separate analysis.

We did not observe strongly different reasons for attendance among service users between sites or between single-occasion attenders versus reattenders. Clinical audits and process evaluation would also be helpful to understanding why QEH patients were much more likely to be referred to other services.

We plan to undertake future research to better understand barriers faced by N&W residents when trying to obtain GP-level care. We have used involvement of patient and public advisors to explore how A&E attenders with low acuity conditions may be asked about their experiences of seeking health care without conferring stigma. Collecting such data would provide specificity and focus about real-world barriers that people face and cause them to find it appealing to obtain unscheduled GP-level care by attending A&E. Preliminary comments from our public advisors include that from a patient's perspective, A&E visits seem to provide more reassurance and faster resolution than visits to a GP surgery. GDAE format services may help to provide these benefits to persons who attend A&Es while reducing the risks of possible over-investigation and over-treatment [22], especially in an era when routine GP appointments seem very challenging to obtain. [23]

Strengths and Limitations

To know whether the GDAE services described in this service evaluation have achieved the most appropriate level of care would require patient history audits by clinically qualified staff; we did not have resources to attempt that. We lacked access to sensitive individual patient clinical data to assess how often reattendances were for the same condition that caused initial presentation. We recommend to commissioners that evaluation of potential

benefits or harms of GDAE format services should ideally include clinical audit to ascertain if reattendances tend to be for exacerbations of initial conditions or for unrelated health problems. Such audit results would, however, need to be interpreted with reference to frequency of reattendance to A&E itself for related conditions, and/or to community GP surgeries, for escalations of health problems that were recently treated by same type of service.

Performance of the 4hKPI at JPUH and QEH was only analysed descriptively; a different study design would be necessary to evaluate GDAE design services impacts on the 4hKPI robustly against other initiatives that try to improve the 4hKPI. We have not attempted cost benefit analysis; it seems likely that most GDAE services do not provide high value for money because of their frequent use of locum staff (paid at higher rates than contracted staff). Our study benefited from a large and comprehensive dataset because of careful planning from time of service inception to ensure an informative service evaluation. “Lack of consistent evaluation” is a chronic problem in the NHS [24], which means that commissioners struggle to know what benefits may have been achieved or not; our study attempts redress this information deficit.

GP at door of A&E services in N&WICS appeared to avert more than 26,000 A&E attendances. This may have helped cause a relative improvement in the 4hKPI at one of the study sites. The services have been busy and resulted in high satisfaction among service users. The JPUH service was somewhat more efficient than QEH (shorter wait times, fewer onward referrals) in spite of JPUH serving a more deprived (presumably with greater morbidities) population; this finding suggests there may be opportunities for efficiency gains at the QEH GDAE. Reattendance is common at both sites, suggesting an undesirable outcome : some attenders may now prefer GDAE over their usual GP service. GDAE data could be used to help frequent attenders find more appropriate service pathways. Process evaluation would be useful to understand why GDAE seemed more successful at one site than the other.

Acknowledgements: The services were hosted by the JPUH and QEHL and funded by Norfolk & Waveney integrated care system and JPUH. JB is affiliated to the National Institute for Health Research Health Protection Research Unit (NIHR HPRU) in Emergency Preparedness and Response at King's College London in partnership with the UK Health Security Agency (UK HSA) and collaboration with the University of East Anglia. The views expressed are those of the authors and not necessarily those of any collaborating or funder institution.

Conflict of interest: All authors declare that we have no conflict of interest. Service activity data were collated by a contracted third party organization, Paradigm Leaders, who had no role in data analysis or writing this document or its conclusions.

Ethical approval for this study was granted by the University of East Anglia Faculty of Medicine and Health Ethics Committee (Reference: ETH2122-1954, 22 June 2022).

Author contributions:

PE helped design the service and conceived of the evaluation, which was designed by JB and PE. AR and JB designed data collection and secured ethics and research governance approval with oversight from GH. JB and AR planned and undertook analysis, JB wrote the first draft and assembled revisions. All authors revised for content.

References

1. Kmietowicz Z. A&E attendances in England are growing twice as fast as population. *British Medical Journal*. 2018;362:k3921.
2. Mortimore A, Cooper S. The "4-hour target": emergency nurses' views. *Emergency Medicine Journal*. 2007;24(6):402-4.
3. Jones S, Moulton C, Swift S, Molyneux P, Black S, Mason N, et al. Association between delays to patient admission from the emergency department and all-cause 30-day mortality. *Emergency Medicine Journal*. 2022;39(3):168-73.
4. Osborne M. Should I be more concerned about patient care or the four-hour target? *Emergency Nurse*. 2023;31(3).
5. Appleby J. What's the point of waiting time targets if they can't be met? *British Medical Journal*. 2019;364.
6. O'Keeffe C, Mason S, Jacques R, Nicholl J. Characterising non-urgent users of the emergency department (ED): a retrospective analysis of routine ED data. *PLoS One*. 2018;13(2):e0192855.
7. Morris T, Mason SM, Moulton C, O'Keeffe C. Calculating the proportion of avoidable attendances at UK emergency departments: analysis of the Royal College of Emergency Medicine's Sentinel Site Survey data. *Emergency Medicine Journal*. 2018;35(2):114-9.
8. Ismail SA, Gibbons DC, Gnani S. Reducing inappropriate accident and emergency department attendances: a systematic review of primary care service interventions. *British Journal of General Practice*. 2013;63(617):e813-e20.

9. National Guideline Centre. Emergency and acute medical care in over 16s: Service delivery and organisation. National Institute for Health and Care Excellence; 2018 March 2018. Contract No.: No. 94.
10. Chu VT, Freeman-Ponder B, Lindquist S, Spitters C, Kawakami V, Dyal JW, et al. Investigation and serologic follow-up of contacts of an early confirmed case-patient with COVID-19, Washington, USA. *Emerging Infectious Diseases*. 2020;26(8):1671.
11. Uthman OA, Walker C, Lahiri S, Jenkinson D, Adekanmbi V, Robertson W, et al. General practitioners providing non-urgent care in emergency department: A natural experiment. *BMJ Open*. 2018;8(5):e019736.
12. NHS. Next steps on the NHS Five Year Forward View. 2017 8 Mar 2019. Contract No.: 30 Mar.
13. Brainard J, Rushton S, Winters T, Hunter PR. Spatial Risk Factors for Pillar 1 COVID-19 Excess Cases and Mortality in Rural Eastern England, UK. *Risk Analysis*. 2022;42(7):1571-84.
14. Aldus CF, Pope I, Brainard JS, Ruston A, Hughes G, Everden P. Feasibility and evaluation of an emergency department-based GP streaming and treatment service. *Journal of Evaluation in Clinical Practice* 2022:1-10.
15. McLennan D, Noble S, Noble M, Plunkett E, Wright G, Gutacker N. The English Indices of Deprivation 2019: Technical report. 2019 September.
16. Nuffield Trust. A&E waiting times: Nuffield Trust; 2022 [updated Oct 31. Available from: <https://www.nuffieldtrust.org.uk/resource/a-e-waiting-times>.
17. Scantlebury A, Adamson J, Salisbury C, Brant H, Anderson H, Baxter H, et al. Do general practitioners working in or alongside the emergency department improve clinical outcomes or experience? A mixed-methods study. *BMJ open*. 2022;12(9):e063495.
18. Gaughan J, Liu D, Gutacker N, Bloor K, Doran T, Bengler JR. Does the presence of general practitioners in emergency departments affect quality and safety in English NHS hospitals? A retrospective observational study. *BMJ Open*. 2022;12(2):e055976.
19. Brant H, Voss S, Morton K, Cooper A, Edwards M, Price D, et al. Current provision of general practitioner services in or alongside emergency departments in England. *Emergency Medicine Journal*. 2021;38(10):780-3.
20. McGill E, Marks D, Er V, Penney T, Petticrew M, Egan M. Qualitative process evaluation from a complex systems perspective: a systematic review and framework for public health evaluators. *PLoS medicine*. 2020;17(11):e1003368.
21. BBC News. King's Lynn hospital patients fear roof collapse - health watchdog: BBC; 2022 [updated Nov 13. Available from: <https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-england-norfolk-63609257>.
22. NHS Confederation. Re-envisioning urgent and emergency care 2022 [updated Dec 1. Available from: <https://www.nhsconfed.org/publications/re-envisioning-urgent-and-emergency-care>.
23. Hayward E, Kendix M, Lay K. One in four UK adults can't see a GP and 12-hour A&E waits are soaring. *The Times*. 2023 Jan 30.
24. Roy E. Lack of consistent evaluation lets down case for public health interventions: *Health Services Journal*; 2019 [updated May 14. Available from: <https://www.hsj.co.uk/finance-and-efficiency/lack-of-consistent-evaluation-lets-down-case-for-public-health-interventions/7025057.article>.

Figure captions

Figure 1. Service activity for completed GDAE service users. a. time of day for arrivals; b. arrival proportions in most recent 12 months of service; c. elapsed time from arrival to being seen.

Figure 2: Four hour key performance indicator (4hKPI) at JPUH/QEH and comparator group of Accident and Emergency departments

It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).






Figure 1. Service activity for completed GDAE service users. a. time of day for arrivals; b. arrival proportions in most recent 12 months of service; c. elapsed time from arrival to being seen.

It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

Figure 2: 4hKPI, JPUH/QEH and comparator group of A&Es



a.



b.

Notes: Data source: NHS England. Comparator sites are defined in text (A&Es with similar attendance counts and facilities in September 2021). Dashed lines: before GDAE service; solid lines: after GDAE service.

Appendix

Triage Inclusion/Exclusion criteria:

The service does not have a strict inclusion/exclusion criterion. It relies on the clinical acumen of the clinicians working in the service. The criteria that are in place are outlined below:

Patient Inclusion Criteria

- * All patients who self-present to the emergency department will have the opportunity to access a general practice appointment if they are registered with a Norwich, North Norfolk, West Norfolk, Great Yarmouth and Waveney, or South Norfolk GP Practice and are assessed by a clinician to be suitable for primary care.
- * Patients out with this catchment area may also be seen by the service due to an update in the process and agreement. Details of their review by the service will be sent to their own GP surgery.
- * Children may be seen by the service for minor illness complaints where appropriate as assessed by the GP or ANP.

Patient Exclusion Criteria

- * Any patient requiring intervention or investigation within ED
- * Non-traumatic chest pain
- * Any patients with signs or symptoms of stroke
- * Any patients, that are not registered with a GP Surgery within the UK
- * All children presenting to ED with injuries
- * Children under three months

Study sites (yellow fill) and comparator sites (green fill) in England, UK. Comparator sites were chosen because they had between 4000 and 10,000 Type 01 attendances in September 2021.

	September 2021 Type 1 attendances (count)
Accident and Emergency service provider	
James Paget University Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust	6,934
The Queen Elizabeth Hospital, King's Lynn, NHS Foundation Trust	6,487
Whittington Health NHS Trust	9,275
Birmingham Women's And Children's NHS Foundation Trust	5,582
Chesterfield Royal Hospital NHS Foundation Trust	5,916
George Eliot Hospital NHS Trust	6,203
South Warwickshire NHS Foundation Trust	7,035
Wye Valley NHS Trust	5,676
Airedale NHS Foundation Trust	5,996
Barnsley Hospital NHS Foundation Trust	8,872
Gateshead Health NHS Foundation Trust	5,614
Harrogate And District NHS Foundation Trust	4,824
Sheffield Children's NHS Foundation Trust	5,198
Alder Hey Children's NHS Foundation Trust	5,910
Countess Of Chester Hospital NHS Foundation Trust	6,694
East Cheshire NHS Trust	4,434
Mid Cheshire Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust	6,893
Isle Of Wight NHS Trust	3,318
Royal Surrey County Hospital NHS Foundation Trust	6,735
Dorset County Hospital NHS Foundation Trust	4,145
North Bristol NHS Trust	8,392
Royal United Hospitals Bath NHS Foundation Trust	7,295
Salisbury NHS Foundation Trust	4,634
Torbay And South Devon NHS Foundation Trust	5,759
Yeovil District Hospital NHS Foundation Trust	5,296

Patient Satisfaction Questions (invited to contribute after service completed)

GP Front Door - Patient feedback (existing service monitoring)

You have been seen today in a Primary Care service. This is a separate service to Accident and Emergency (A&E)

We would like to ask you a few short questions regarding your experience today. Should you wish to feedback further on your experiences, you will have to opportunity to leave your contact details if you wish at the end.

1. Who referred you to the Emergency Department today

You came yourself (self-referral)

Your GP advised you to attend

You called 111 and they advised you to attend

Other (details requested)

2. Were you aware of this trial Service before you arrived today?

Yes

No

Other (details requested)

3. How did you find the person you met in the Emergency Department (our Streamer)

Excellent

Good

Fair

Poor

Very Poor

Other (details requested)

4. How helpful did you find our Receptionist who booked you in?

Very helpful

Somewhat helpful

Neither helpful nor unhelpful

Somewhat unhelpful

Very unhelpful

Other (details requested)

5. How did you find the consultation with the Clinician / Doctor

Excellent

Good

Fair

Poor

Very Poor

Other (details requested)

6. Would you recommend our Service to your friends and family?

Yes

No

Other (details requested)

It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](#) .

7. How do you think we should improve our Service? (Free text answer)

8. We are running an evaluation alongside this service for us to learn from it and hopefully improve the service further. Should you choose to provide your email and phone number and contact name below we may well contact you for further insight into your experience of the service that you have engaged with today.

Please add any further comments (Free text answer)